1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ROBERT WILLIAM TUNSTALL, JR.,	No. 2:16-CV-2604-KJM-DMC-P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	JOSEPH BICK, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to	
18	42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 22, 2020, the Court found multiple deficiencies in plaintiff's fourth	
19	amended complaint and ordered that plaintiff may withdraw the complaint and proceed on his	
20	third amended complaint instead. See ECF No. 71. Plaintiff was warned that failure to do so	
21	would result in the dismissal of his action. <u>Id.</u> Despite this, plaintiff did not withdraw his fourth	
22	amended complaint. On August 5, 2020, the Court issued findings and recommendations (F&Rs)	
23	recommending that plaintiff's action be dismissed for failure to correct the deficiencies identified	
	11 C 4 11 11 C FORN 70 0 4 140 0000 11 100 1	

amended complaint. Plaintiff also complains that his previous requests for appointment of counsel

in his fourth amended complaint. See ECF No. 73. On August 13, 2020, plaintiff submitted

has been removed and, as a result, he is incapable of producing a withdrawal of his fourth

objections to the F&Rs. See ECF No. 74. In his objections, plaintiff states that half of his brain

24

25

26

27

28

have been denied.

Therefore, the Court shall, sua sponte, grant plaintiff an additional thirty days in which to 1) withdraw his fourth amended complaint (ECF No. 68) and proceed on his third amended complaint which states cognizable claims; or 2) provide to the Court clear and current medical information that would support plaintiff's claimed inability to address the deficiencies in the fourth amended complaint, and alleged need for appointment of counsel. On receipt of plaintiff's response, the Court will issue an order addressing both the status of plaintiff's pleading and plaintiff's request for appointment of counsel. Plaintiff is further warned that failure to respond shall result in continued processing of the F&Rs dismissing this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

1 Dated: August 27, 2020

DENNIS M. COTA UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE